

For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 3, 13, 23 and 25-27 are not rendered obvious by *Looney* and *Wyman*.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Claim 13 depends from claim 11. Claim 23 depends from claim 21. Claims 25-27 depend from claim 24. As discussed above, *Looney* does not teach or suggest the invention in claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21, 23 and 24-30. *Wyman* is cited to teach different nodes belonging to different accounts. Whether or not *Wyman* discloses different nodes belonging to different accounts, *Wyman* does not cure the deficiencies of *Looney*. Therefore, no combination of *Looney* and *Wyman* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claims 3, 13, 23 and 25-27.

For at least the foregoing reasons Applicants submit that claims 3, 13, 23 and 25-27 are not anticipated by *Looney*. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 3, 13, 23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

IX. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account

No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date:

APRIL 29, 2002



Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200